➣
CCE
$\simeq$
()
Ш
П
ĭ
т'
Ш
$\Box$
ED F
- 11
$\circ$
¥
70
П
푸
Ų
$\cap$
PROCESS
$\overline{}$
Ш
(n
čń
<u>5</u>
ラ
$\stackrel{\leftarrow}{=}$
(ı)
-
2021
0
$\sim$
_
~
<u> </u>
O
⊒.
_
pril 2
2
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
_
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 202
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 202
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 202
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 202
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 202
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 202
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 2020-284-
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 202
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 2020-284-T -
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 2020-284-T - P
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 2020-284-T - P
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 2020-284-T - P
1 4:23 PM - SCPSC - 2020-284-T -

Action Item	3
	-

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION DIRECTIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER		DATE	April 21, 2021
MOTOR CARRIER MATTER	<b>✓</b>	DOCKET NO.	2020-284-T
UTILITIES MATTER		ORDER NO.	

## **SUBJECT:**

Docket No. 2020-284-T - Application of R & M Charlotte, LLC d/b/a Two Men and A Truck of Charlotte (f/k/a R & M Charlotte LLC d/b/a Two Men and a Truck of Rock Hill) to Amend Tariff - Staff Presents for Commission Consideration R & M Charlotte, LLC d/b/a Two Men and A Truck of Charlotte's Petition for Rehearing or Reconsideration of Commission Directive Denying the Request to "Implement a Maximum Variable-Type Rate Tariff" Because That Tariff "May Not Prevent Customer Discrimination."

## **COMMISSION ACTION:**

I move that the Commission deny R&M Charlotte, LLC d/b/a Two Men and a Truck of Charlotte's Petition for Rehearing or Reconsideration of the Commission's Directive denying the request to implement a maximum variable-type rate tariff. This Commission ruled that such a tariff may not prevent customer discrimination. I still believe that a maximum variable-type rate tariff could still be offered at the whim of the carrier, resulting in different rates for similar services. As pointed out by counsel for the carrier, if the Commission granted a maximum variable-type rate tariff for this Company, it would be the first household goods moving company regulated by this Commission to operate under this maximum rate structure. Although the Company states that it does not object to any other carrier operating in a similar way, I do not think that it is appropriate policy to approve such a deviation from structured tariffs as a result of one company's request. I believe that the Commission would need to study the proposal in depth, since other companies would likely ask for a similar rate structure. In short, I think that the request for such a drastic change in a transportation rate structure is premature, especially coming from one Company. I do believe that the matter of a maximum variable-type rate tariff would be appropriate for study in the upcoming review of the Commission's Transportation Regulations under Docket No. 2020-247-A, and I move that this be done. However, again, I move that Petition for Rehearing or Reconsideration in this matter be denied.

PRESIDING:	<u>J. Williams</u>			SESSION:	<u>Regular</u>	TIME: <u>11:00 a.m</u>	
	MOTION	YES	NO	OTHER			
BELSER		<b>✓</b>		Present in Hearing Room			
CASTON		<b>✓</b>		Present in Hearing Room			
ERVIN		<b>✓</b>			Voting via W	/ebex	
POWERS	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>			Present in H	earing Room	
THOMAS		<b>✓</b>			Voting via W	/ebex	
C. WILLIAMS		<b>✓</b>			Voting via W	/ebex	
J. WILLIAMS		<b>✓</b>			Present in H	earing Room	
							_

(SEAL) RECORDED BY: J. Schmieding

